



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,640	02/13/2002	Michael Nuttall	500803.02	9841

7590 12/15/2004

Paul F. Rusyn, Esq.
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Suite 3400
1420 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

EXAMINER


VU, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2818

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/075,640	Applicant(s) NUTTALL ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID VU	Art Unit 2818	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38 and 45-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 38 and 45-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.914

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the, fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 23, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 60 recites the limitation ““wherein the electromagnetic radiation comprises collimated electromagnetic radiation ” in page 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
3. Claim 61 recites the limitation ““wherein the electromagnetic radiation comprises collimated electromagnetic radiation ” in page 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 38 and 45-59 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blanchard (US 6,593,174).

Regarding claims 38, 45, 52, 53 and 57, Blanchard discloses in figs. 3-4 and in related text (col. 3, line 50-col. 5, line. 19) an in-process semiconductor structure, comprising: a substrate 102; a plurality of active regions; a plurality of isolation oxide regions 110/112 adjacent the active regions, each isolation oxide region 110/112 being positioned between adjacent active regions to isolate adjacent active regions; and at least one selectively formed contact 124 epitaxially grown on each active region, each selectively formed contact 124 being isolated from contacts on adjacent active regions, each selectively formed contact having a curved upper surface intersected by two sidewall surfaces, the two sidewalls surfaces being substantially perpendicular to an upper surface of the active region.

Art Unit: 2818

Regarding claims 46-51, 54-56 and 58-59, Blanchard discloses the epitaxial contact region may include the same material as the substrate (col. 2, lines 25-28) and may be silicon, gallium arsenide, SiGe (col. 4, lines 55-64).

5. Claims 38, 45, 46, 49, 52-54, 57, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gardner et al. (US 6,362,510, herein after Gardner).

Regarding claims 38, 45, 46, 49, 52-54 and 57, Gardner discloses in figs. 3-6 and in related text (col. 8, line 29-col. 9, line. 15) an in-process semiconductor structure, comprising: a substrate 100; a plurality of active regions; a plurality of isolation oxide regions 102 adjacent the active regions, each isolation oxide region 102 being positioned between adjacent active regions to isolate adjacent active regions; and at least one selectively formed contact 106 epitaxially grown on each active region, each selectively formed contact 106 being isolated from contacts on adjacent active regions, each selectively formed contact having a upper surface intersected by two sidewall surfaces, the two sidewalls surfaces being substantially perpendicular to an upper surface of the active region. The selectively formed contact 106 is inherently having a curved upper surface since Gardner disclose the selectively formed contact 106 is perferably formed through methods (epitaxially grown) and materials analogous or equivalent to the methods and materials employed in forming the selectively formed contact as taught by the present invention.

Regarding claims 60 and 61, Gardner discloses the collimated electromagnetic radiation (col. 8, line 63-col. 9, line 15).

Art Unit: 2818

6. Regarding the limitation that "epitaxially grown" (claims 38, 52 and 57) or "wherein the electromagnetic radiation comprises collimated electromagnetic radiation" (claims 60 and 61), such limitation does not further define the structure as instantly claimed, nor serve to distinguish over Hasegawa. Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); *In re Marosi et al*, 218 USPQ 289; and particularly *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw make clear.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm. If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Art Unit: 2818

David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR, Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Vu

December 10, 2004.